HN

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/814,315	03/21/2001	Gordon Earle	23265-011	3772

30623 7590 11/08/2005

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY
AND POPEO, P.C.
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER	
LU, KUEN S	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2167	

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/814,315	EARLE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kuen S. Lu	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 August 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Action is responsive to the Applicant's Amendments, filed on August 22, 2005. Noted and accepted is the amendments made to the Abstract wherein the superfluous phrase "The present invention..." has been removed. The Examiner's objection to the Abstract is hereby withdrawn.

2. Also noted is the amendments made to each of the independent claims 1, 14 and 22, wherein the amended element *"a list model ~~representing~~ associated with at least one step in the transaction, the list model comprising a list of at least one state or set of information that can be attained by or is associated with the ~~at least one~~ entity ~~associated with~~ involved in the transaction"* is considered by the Examiner as a new issue introduced to overcome the Examiner's Office Action for non-Final Rejection of February 22, 2005. The Examiner has introduced a new reference to address the new issue and other amended elements of the independent claims, along with every claim, including the newly added claims 23-25, in the Office Action for Final Rejection (hereafter "the Action"). The amendments made to the Specification as described in Page 2 and filed on August 22, 2005, is accepted by the Examiner.

3. Concerning the Applicant's Remarks on claim rejections, filed on August 22, has been fully considered by the Examiner. Please see discussion in the section ***Response to Arguments***, following the Action, as shown next.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 24 is objected to because of the following informalities: The term "the list-model" seems to be a typographical error of "the list model". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claim 1, 3-4, 14 and 22-25 are rejected under U. S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over OraAPP (Oracle® Applications Concepts, Release 11 for UNIX, 1998, Oracle®, hereafter "OraAPP") and in view of OraInv (Oracle® Inventory Technical Reference Manual, Release 11i, December 1999, Oracle®, hereafter "OraInv").

As per claims 1, 14 and 22, OraAPP teaches the following:

"a web server implementing a user interface to said system" (See Fig. 1-1 and Pages 1-2, 1-3 and 1-6 wherein OraAPP's web server serves client web browser to communicate

with other tiers in the Oracle Application System is equivalent to the Applicant's a web server implementing a user interface to said system); and

"a database server in operable communication with the web server, the database server comprising a data architecture representing the business process" (See Fig. 1-1, Pages 1-2 ,1-8 and 2-1 to 2-3 wherein OraAPP's database contains Oracle Application data and architecture to support business processes, such as MRP, Financials and EDI, etc, is equivalent to the Applicant's a database server in operable communication with the web server, the database server comprising a data architecture representing the business process).

OraAPP does not specifically teach "an entity model representing at least one entity responsible for implementing at least a portion of the business process", although OraAPP teaches modeling sales and marketing analysis under application environment AS_TOP at Pages 2-3 and 2-4.

"an entity model representing at least one entity responsible for implementing at least a portion of the business process" (See Page 2-16 and Diagram 2: Inventory Setup wherein OraInv's Inventory Setup model comprises entities MTL_MATERIAL_TRANSACTIONS, MTL_TRX_SOURCE_TYPES and MTL_TRANSACTION_TYPES are par of setting up inventory business process is equivalent to the Applicant's an entity model representing at least one entity responsible for implementing at least a portion of the business process). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine the teachings of OraInv and OraAPP because OraAPP teaches an

integrated system for financials, MRP, HRMS, etc. and OraInv is a component product of financial applications, and the combination would have enabled material inventory users to utilize concurrent managers to submit processes to be processed concurrently or in-parallel in the background while continue performing fore-ground tasks for performance improvement.

The combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references further teaches the following:

"a transaction model representing at least one transaction in the business process in which the entity is involved" (See OraInv: Pages 2-10, 2-23 and Diagram 9 wherein OracInv's miscellaneous transactions model performing miscellaneous issues to and receipts from accounts involving entities MTL_MATERIAL_TRANSACTIONS, MTL_TRX_SOURCE_TYPES and MTL_TRANSACTION_TYPES is equivalent to the Applicant's a transaction model representing at least one transaction in the business process in which the entity is involved);

"a list associated with at least one step in the transaction, the list model comprising a list of at least one state or set of information that can be attained by or is associated with the entity involved in the transaction" (See OraAPP: Pages 1-10 and 2-4 wherein OraAPP's internal concurrent manager processing is the model to monitor the database table for new requests, control the other concurrent managers and determine when a transaction request from a component product, such as Inventory's miscellaneous transactions, should be processed and which concurrent manager should carry it out, and OraInv: Pages 2-62 and 3-5 wherein OraInv's INVTTMTX is the concurrent

program form to perform inventory miscellaneous transactions involving entities MTL_MATERIAL_TRANSACTIONS, MTL_TRX_SOURCE_TYPES and MTL_TRANSACTION_TYPES where concurrent program populates inventory data to change inventory status and state is equivalent to the Applicant's a list associated with at least one step in the transaction, the list model comprising a list of at least one state or set of information that can be attained by or is associated with the entity involved in the transaction); and

"a task model associated with the list, the task model representing at least one task associated with the at least one step in the transaction" (See OraAPP: Pages 1-9 and 1-10 wherein OraAPP's the running concurrent processes are the executable programs operate in the background to define and perform the Application tasks as requested, and OraInv: Pages 2-10, 2-23 and Diagram 9 wherein OracInv's miscellaneous transactions model performing miscellaneous issues to and receipts from accounts involving entities is equivalent to the Applicant's a task model associated with the list, the task model representing at least one task associated with the at least one step in the transaction).

As per claim 3, the combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references teaches "the entity model, transaction model, list model, and task model are objects" (See OraAPP: Fig. 3-13, Pages 2-1 and 1-7 to 1-10 wherein OraAPP's application architecture, concurrent processes and concurrent managers are built on or work on the objects created on the database tier are the list and task models, and OraInv: Pages 2-

10, 2-16, 2-23 and Diagrams 2, 7 and 10 wherein entity and transactions are modeled is equivalent to the Applicant's the entity model, transaction model, list model, and task model are objects).

As per claim 4, the combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references teaches "each object is associated with a primary key" (See OraInv: Page 3-557 wherein OraInv's MTL_TRANSACTION_TYPES stores primary keys data is equivalent to the Applicant's each object is associated with a primary key).

As per claim 23, the combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references teaches "the entity is selected from the group consisting of an organization, a human, and a location" (See OraInv: Pages 2-22 and 3-576 wherein MTL_PARAMETERS and MTL_USER_DEMAND entities contains organization, location and human data is equivalent to the Applicant's the entity is selected from the group consisting of an organization, a human, and a location).

As per claim 24, the combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references teaches "the list model is configured so as to leave the entity model unmodified by its association with the list" (See OraAPP: Pages 1-10 and 2-4 wherein OraAPP's internal concurrent manager processing is the model to monitor the database table for new requests, control the other concurrent managers and determine when a transaction request from a component product, such as Inventory's miscellaneous transactions,

should be processed and which concurrent manager should carry it out, and OraInv: Pages 2-62 and 3-5 wherein OraInv's INVTTMTX is the concurrent program form to perform inventory miscellaneous transactions involving entities MTL_MATERIAL_TRANSACTIONS, MTL_TRX_SOURCE_TYPES and MTL_TRANSACTION_TYPES where concurrent program populates inventory data to change inventory status and state, however, the entity models remain unmodified during the concurrent program execution).

As per claim 25, the combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references teaches "the task represented in the task model is also associated with the entity" (See OraAPP: Pages 1-9 and 1-10 wherein OraAPP's the running concurrent processes are the executable programs operate in the background to define and perform the Application tasks as requested, and OraInv: Pages 2-10, 2-23 and Diagram 9 wherein OracInv's miscellaneous transactions model performing miscellaneous issues to and receipts from accounts involving entities is equivalent to the Applicant's the task represented in the task model is also associated with the entity).

7. Claim 2, 5-13 and 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over OraAPP (Oracle® Applications Concepts, Release 11 for UNIX, 1998, Oracle®, hereafter "OraAPP") in view of OraInv (Oracle® Inventory Technical Reference Manual, Release 11i, December 1999, Oracle®, hereafter "OraInv"), as applied to claims 1, 14 and 22 above, and further in view of OraSAM (Oracle® Sales and Marketing Connected Client User's Guide, Release 11, March 1988, Oracle®, hereafter "OraSAM").

As per claim 2, the combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references teaches a database server comprising data architecture representing a business process as previously described in claims 1, 14 and 22 rejections, furthermore, the OraAPP references teaches concurrent managers running on concurrent server(s) for controlling concurrent and parallel processes (See Pages 1-9 and 1-10).

The combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references does not specifically teach "individual user specifications (IUS)".

However, OraSAM teaches "individual user specifications" (See Pages 1-17 to 1-21 wherein OraSAM's profile options are available for grouping to define individual users is equivalent to the Applicant's individual user specifications).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine the teachings of OraSAM, OraInv and OraAPP references because OraAPP teaches an integrated system for financials, MRP, HRMS, etc. and OraInv and OraSAM are component products of financial applications, and the combination would have enabled Inventory, Sales and Marketing users to utilize concurrent managers to submit processes to be processed concurrently or in-parallel in the background while continue performing fore-ground tasks for performance improvement.

OraSAM further teaches "company specific parameters (CSP)" (See Page 2-8 wherein OraSAM's company profile parameters are entered or updated is equivalent to the Applicant's company specific parameters); and

"vertical market system parameters (VMSP) including a set of vertical market templates that operate on top of the data architecture" (See Pages 1-17 to 1-21 wherein OraSAM's profile options are available for grouping to define a specific site parameters for a particular industry or business is equivalent to the Applicant's vertical market system parameters [VMSP] including a set of vertical market templates that operate on top of the data architecture).

The combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references further teaches "a database manager in communication with and operative to manage the IUS, CSP, and VMSP" (See OraAPP: Fig. 1-3, Pages 1-5, 2-4 wherein OraAPP's IUS, CSP and VMSP are defined and operated under Sales and Marketing which is a component product in the Marketing Management family of Oracle Applications whose tier communicates with database tier is equivalent to the Applicant's a database manager in communication with and operative to manage the IUS, CSP, and VMSP).

As per claim 5, the combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references teaches a database server comprising an architecture as previously described in claims 1, 14 and 22 rejections.

The combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references does not specifically teach "an activities model".

However, OraSAM teaches "an activities model" (See Page 6-5 wherein OraSAM's an user account activity table is created to manage user activities is equivalent to the Applicant's an activities model).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine the teachings of OraSAM, OraInv and OraAPP references because OraAPP teaches an integrated system for financials, MRP, HRMS, etc. and OraInv and OraSAM are component products of financial applications, and the combination would have enabled Inventory, Sales and Marketing users to utilize concurrent managers to submit user account activity processes to be processed concurrently or in-parallel in the background while continue performing fore-ground tasks for performance improvement.

As per claim 6, the combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references an entity model representing an entity responsible for implementing Sales and Marketing processes as previously described in claims 1, 14 and 22 rejections.

The combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references does not specifically teach the entity model comprising "an entity list representing at least one entity responsible for implementing at least a portion of the business process".

However, OraSAM teaches "an entity list representing at least one entity responsible for implementing at least a portion of the business process" (See Pages 3-2 and 4-2 wherein OraSAM's listing contacts information and registering contact for events is equivalent to the Applicant's an entity list representing at least one entity responsible for implementing at least a portion of the business process).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine the teachings of OraSAM, OraInv and

OraAPP references because OraAPP teaches an integrated system for financials, MRP, HRMS, etc. and OraInv and OraSAM are component products of financial applications, and the combination would have enabled Sales and Marketing users to utilize information from other integrated product entities such that business processes of Sales and Marketing could have been operated properly.

OraSAM further teaches the following:

"a core record of information coupled to the entity list and operative to store core information" (See Page 3-8 wherein OraSAM's contact's private mailing address is listed, updated and saved is equivalent to the Applicant's a core record of information coupled to the entity list and operative to store core information);

"a lookup table for entity types coupled to the entity list and operative to store information associated with entity types" (See Pages 2-12 and 2-13 wherein OraSAM's interest type is selected from a list and saved for updating the company information is equivalent to the Applicant's a lookup table for entity types coupled to the entity list and operative to store information associated with entity types);

"a table of entity sub types coupled to the entity list and operative to store entity sub types" (See Page 2-14 wherein OraSAM's the company classification is updated saved by selecting a type from a list of values, such as "sector", "hardware", etc and a subtype from a list of primary codes such as "commercial", "federal", "public", etc. is equivalent to the Applicant's a table of entity sub types coupled to the entity list and operative to store entity sub types);

"a lookup table of entity sub types coupled to the table of entity sub types and operative to store information associated with entity sub types" (See Page 2-14 wherein OraSAM's the company classification is updated saved by selecting a type from a list of values, such as "sector", "hardware", etc and a subtype from a list of primary codes such as "commercial", "federal", "public", etc. is equivalent to the Applicant's a table of entity sub types coupled to the entity list and operative to store entity sub types);

"a table of entity relationships coupled to the entity list and operative to store entity relationship information" (See Page 2-14 wherein OraSAM's the company classification is updated saved by selecting a type from a list of values, such as "sector", "hardware", etc and a subtype from a list of primary codes such as "commercial", "federal", "public", etc. and a secondary code from a list of values where the relation established between type, primary and secondary codes is equivalent to the Applicant's a table of entity relationships coupled to the entity list and operative to store entity relationship information); and

"a lookup table of entity relationship types coupled to the table of entity relationships and operative to store information associated with entity relationships" (See Page 2-14 wherein OraSAM's the company classification is updated saved by selecting a type from a list of values, such as "sector", "hardware", etc and a subtype from a list of primary codes such as "commercial", "federal", "public", etc. and a secondary code from a list of values where the relation established between and operated on type, primary and secondary codes is equivalent to the Applicant's a lookup table of entity relationship

types coupled to the table of entity relationships and operative to store information associated with entity relationships).

As per claim 7, OraSAM further teaches "the entity types are a function of at least one of company specific system parameters and vertical market system parameters" (See Page 2-14 wherein OraSAM's account is classified into type, primary and secondary hierarchically specific to the organization's product and customers is equivalent to the Applicant's the entity types are a function of at least one of company specific system parameters and vertical market system parameters).

As per claim 8, the combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references teaches a transaction model comprising at least one transaction in the business process as previously described in claims 1, 14 and 22 rejections wherein Sales and Marketing is one model integrated to the Applications model.

The combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references does not specifically teach "a plurality of transactions, each transaction being associated with at least one entity".

However, OraSAM teaches "a plurality of transactions, each transaction being associated with at least one entity" (See Pages 7-6 and 7-7 wherein OraSAM's customers place orders and each order is associated with entities such as sales rep, sales channel and product agreement is equivalent to the Applicant's a plurality of transactions, each transaction being associated with at least one entity).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine the teachings of OraSAM, OraInv and OraAPP references because OraAPP teaches an integrated system for financials, MRP, HRMS, etc. and OraInv and OraSAM are component products of financial applications, and the combination would have enabled Inventory, Sales and Marketing users to utilize information from other integrated product entities such that business processes of customer order details could have been operated properly.

OraSAM further teaches "a plurality of transaction details tables (TDT), each TDT associated with a transaction and including high-level information about the associated transaction" (See Pages 7-6 and 7-7 wherein OraSAM's order line items details customer orders and each line item associated with information such as list price, selling price and discount associated with the order transaction is equivalent to the Applicant's a plurality of transaction details tables (TDT), each TDT associated with a transaction and including high-level information about the associated transaction).

As per claim 9, the combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references teaches a list model representing at least one step in the transaction as previously described in claims 1, 14 and 22 rejections.

The combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references does not specifically teach "a lookup table of lists associated with the list of at least one entity".

However, OraSAM teaches "a lookup table of lists associated with the list of at least one entity" (See Pages C1 to C-10 wherein OraSAM's table for QuickCode lookup type

is provided for Sales and Marketing QuickCode for lookup types and default values associated with entities such as contacts, events and sales is equivalent to the Applicant's a lookup table of lists associated with the list of at least one entity).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine the teachings of OraSAM, OraInv and OraAPP references because OraAPP teaches an integrated system for financials, MRP, HRMS, etc. and OraInv and OraSAM are component products of financial applications, and the combination would have enabled Inventory, Sales and Marketing users to utilize information from other integrated product entities such that business processes of Sales and Marketing could have been operated properly.

As per claim 10, OraSAM further teaches "a lookup table of list categories associated with the lookup table of lists and operative to group lists into categories" (See Pages C-1 to C-10 wherein OraSAM's QuickCode lists group into categories such as events, environment and contacts is equivalent to the Applicant's a lookup table of list categories associated with the lookup table of lists and operative to group lists into categories).

As per claims 11, 18 and 19, OraSAM further teaches "lookup tables for lists-to-be-added-to lists-to-be-removed-from, and list-tasks-to-add, the lookup tables associated with the lookup table of lists" (See Page C-5 wherein OraSAM's lookup code for event facility type, collateral request status and lead status types have values similar to lists-

to-be-added-to lists-to-be-removed-from, list-tasks-to-add and list-tasks-to-add suggests the teaching of tables for lists-to-be-added-to lists-to-be-removed-from, and list-tasks-to-add, the lookup tables associated with the lookup table of lists).

As per claims 12 and 20, OraSAM further teaches "a lookup table for list-cycle-steps associated with the lookup table of lists; and lookup tables for list-cycle-steps-to-add-to, list-cycle-steps-to-remove-from, and list-cycle-step-tasks-to-add, each lookup table being associated with the list-cycle-steps table" (See Pages C-1 to C-10 wherein OraSAM's QuickCode lookup table teaches list-cycle-steps in the interaction type and list-cycle-steps-to-add-to, list-cycle-steps-to-remove-from, and list-cycle-step-tasks-to-add in the event facility type, collateral request status and lead status types is equivalent to the Applicant's a lookup table for list-cycle-steps associated with the lookup table of lists; and lookup tables for list-cycle-steps-to-add-to, list-cycle-steps-to-remove-from, and list-cycle-step-tasks-to-add, each lookup table being associated with the list-cycle-steps table).

As per claim 13, OraSAM further teaches "lists is capable of having associated meta-data" (See Page C-5 wherein OraSAM's user-maintained list of values for event facility type is an item of data about data is equivalent to the Applicant's lists is capable of having associated meta-data).

As per claim 15, OraSAM further teaches "modifying the entity model by modifying at least one of entity types, entity sub types, and entity relationships" (See Page 2-14 wherein OraSAM's the company classification is updated saved by selecting a type from a list of values, such as "sector", "hardware", etc and a subtype from a list of primary codes such as "commercial", "federal", "public", etc. and a secondary code from a list of values where the relation established between and operated on type, primary and secondary codes is equivalent to the Applicant's modifying the entity model by modifying at least one of entity types, entity sub types, and entity relationships).

As per claim 16, OraSAM further teaches "modifying the list model by adding associations to an existing list to track additional information about list members" (See Pages 7-7 and 7-8 wherein OraSAM's customer order line items are modified to associate and track customer order is equivalent to the Applicant's modifying the list model by adding associations to an existing list to track additional information about list members).

As per claim 17, OraSAM further teaches "the list of at least one entity comprises a list entity record and wherein the method further comprises marking the list entity record as removed when at least one of an entity and an entity-transaction pair is removed from the list" (See Page 11-4 wherein OraSAM's maintenance of scripts questions, answers and actions is equivalent to the Applicant's the list of at least one entity comprises a list entity record and wherein the method further comprises marking the list

entity record as removed when at least one of an entity and an entity-transaction pair is removed from the list).

As per claim 21, the combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references teaches "action and time-based rules are recursive" (See OraAPP: Page 11-10 wherein OraSAM's script answer actions can be set up to run automatically on regular basis is equivalent to the Applicant's action and time-based rules are recursive).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments, filed on August 22, 2005, with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered. Please see discussions below.

At Pages 9-14, concerning claims 1-22, the Applicant mainly argued, with examples, that the entity, transaction, list and task models cited from the documents of the Oracle® financial applications are not the same as the subject matter claimed by the Applicant.

As to the above argument, the Examiner respectfully submits that the references cited does reasonably interpret the elements of respective claims, and provides specific teaching for the four models as described in the claim language. The Examiner also respectfully submits the examples as described in the argument does help the Examiner to further comprehend the subject matter, However, it is further submitted that each limitation in the claims has been given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent

with the specification and in light of the supporting disclosure in the Action (See MPEP , 2106 [R-2], 2111 [R-1]). Please further note In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. > E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3Com Corp., 343 F.3d 1364, 1369, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (claims must be interpreted "in view of the specification" without importing limitations from the specification into the claims unnecessarily). Having the above in mind, the Examiner cited Cosic, Collins and Sah references for providing teachings equivalent to the disclosures.

9. In light of the foregoing arguments and the newly introduced OraInv reference, the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of Claims 1-25 is hereby sustained.

Conclusions

10. The prior art made of record

U. OraAPP: Oracle® Applications Concepts, Release 11 for UNIX, 1998, Oracle®.

V. OraSAM: Oracle® Sales and Marketing Connected Client User's Guide, Release 11, March 1988, Oracle®.

W. OraInv: Oracle® Inventory Technical Reference Manual, Release 11i, December 1999, Oracle®

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A. U.S. Publication 2002/0049603

B. U.S. Publication 2002/0103660

C. U.S. Publication 2003/0187670

D. U.S. Publication 2003/0083947

E. U.S. Patent No. 6,523,027

Conclusions

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1 .136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1 .136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuen S. Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4114. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30 am-5:30 pm). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone pre unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jean R. Homere, Esq. can be reached on (571) 272-3780. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for Page 13 published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact he Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 886-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kuen S. Lu
Patent Examiner

November 3, 2005

GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER